

REMARKS

Claims 15, 17 and 19-26 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 15 is amended, and Fig. 6 is replaced by the attached replacement drawing sheet. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. Drawing Objection

The Office Action objects to the drawings because of informalities. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that each of the pixels having at least a TFT device must be shown or the features canceled from the claims. Fig. 6 is corrected to include at least a TFT device in each of the pixels, as shown in the attached Replacement Sheet. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

II. Information Disclosure Statement

An Information Disclosure Statement with Form PTO-1449 was filed in the above-captioned patent application on November 30, 2004. Applicant has not yet received from the Examiner a copy of the Form PTO-1449 initialed to acknowledge the fact that the Examiner has considered the disclosed information. The Examiner is requested to initial and return to the undersigned a copy of the Form PTO-1449. For the convenience of the Examiner, a copy of that form is attached. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider and return the original Form PTO-1449 with the next Office Action.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

A. Tang in view of Wakimoto

The Office Action rejects claims 15, 17, 19-21, 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,550,066 to Tang et al. ("Tang") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,739,635 to Wakimoto ("Wakimoto"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Tang does not teach or suggest an electroluminescent device including "the bank defining the plurality of pixels being provided above the substrate so that the bank and the light-emitting layer are non-overlapping," as recited in independent claim 15.

The Office Action asserts that Tang teaches an active matrix 4-terminal TFT-EL display device including a plurality of pixels having TFT devices, a bank layer 74, an anode 72, a light-emitting layer 82 and a cathode 84. See Figs. 3 and 8. Notwithstanding these assertions, Tang does not teach or suggest a bank being provided so that the bank and a light emitting layer are non-overlapping, as set forth in claim 15.

Tang teaches an active matrix 4-terminal TFT-EL display device including a passivation layer 74 and a TFT-EL pixel. See Fig. 3. The TFT-EL pixel includes a TFT device 42, 44, 46, 48, 52 provided on a substrate 41, a transparent electrode 72 serving as an anode, an organic electroluminescent layer 82 provided above the transparent electrode 72, and an EL cathode 84 provided above the organic electroluminescent layer 82. See Fig. 3. However, Tang does not teach or suggest that the passivation layer 74 is provided above the substrate 41 so that the passivation layer 74 and the organic electroluminescent layer 82 are non-overlapping. Accordingly, Tang does not teach or suggest the electroluminescent device including non-overlapping bank and light-emitting layers, as set forth in claim 15.

Wakimoto, like Tang, does not teach or suggest an electroluminescent device including a bank provided above a substrate so that the bank and a light-emitting layer are non-overlapping. Accordingly, neither Tang nor Wakimoto, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the electroluminescent device of claim 15.

Therefore, claim 15 would not have been rendered obvious by Tang in view of Wakimoto. Claims 17, 19-21, 25 and 26 depend from claim 15, and thus also would not have been rendered obvious by Tang in view of Wakimoto for at least the reasons set forth above,

as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

B. Tang, in view of Wakimoto, and further in view of Roitman

The Office Action rejects claims 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tang in view of Wakimoto, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,111,356 to Roitman et al. ("Roitman"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As discussed above, neither Tang nor Wakimoto, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests an electroluminescent device including a "bank forming the plurality of pixels being provided above the substrate so that the bank and the light-emitting layer are non-overlapping," as recited in independent claim 15.

Roitman does not remedy such deficiencies of Tang and Wakimoto. Specifically, Roitman does not teach or suggest an electroluminescent device including non-overlapping bank and light-emitting layers. See Fig. 4.

Therefore, claim 15 would not have been rendered obvious by Tang in view of Wakimoto, and further in view of Roitman. Claims 22 and 23 depend from claim 15, and thus also would not have been rendered obvious by Tang in view of Wakimoto, and further in view of Roitman for at least the reasons set forth above as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

C. Tang, in view of Wakimoto, and further in view of JP 10-036487

The Office Action rejects claims 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tang in view of Wakimoto, and further in view of Japanese Patent Application Publication No. JP 10-036487. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As discussed above, neither Tang nor Wakimoto, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests an electroluminescent device including "the bank defining the plurality of pixels

being provided above the substrate so that the bank and the light-emitting layer are non-overlapping," as recited in independent claim 15.

JP 10-036487 does not remedy such deficiencies of Tang and Wakimoto.

Specifically, JP 10-036487 does not teach or suggest non-overlapping bank and light-emitting layers.

Therefore, claim 15 would not have been rendered obvious by Tang in view of Wakimoto, and further in view of JP 10-036487. Claim 24 depends from claim 15, and thus also would not have been rendered obvious by Tang in view of Wakimoto, and further in view of JP 10-036487 for at least the reasons set forth above, as well as for the additional features it recites. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 15, 17 and 19-26 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Holly N. Moore
Registration No. 50,212

JAO:HNM/ale

Attachments:

Form PTO-1449 (filed November 30, 2004)
Replacement Sheet (Fig. 6)

Date: February 3, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement drawing sheet makes changes to Figs. 6 and replaces the original sheet with Fig. 6.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

FEB 03 2005

Sheet 1 of 1

Form PTO-1449 (REV. 8-83)		US Dept. of Commerce PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE		ATTY DOCKET NO. 105034	APPLICATION NO. 09/509,121	
INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT (Use several sheets if necessary)				APPLICANT(S) Hidekazu KOBAYASHI		
				FILING DATE March 23, 2000	GROUP 2879	
U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS						
EXAMINER INITIAL		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	NAME	CLASS	SUB CLASS
	1	5,247,190	09/21/1993	Friend et al.		
	2	5,949,089 (corresponds to KR 97 072 513, Reference No. 4)	09/07/1999	Park et al.		
	3	5,677,572	10/14/1997	Hung et al.		
FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS						
		DOCUMENT NUMBER	DATE	COUNTRY	CLASS	SUB CLASS
	4	KR 97 072 513 A (corresponds to U.S. 5,949,089, Reference No. 2)	11/07/1997	Korea		
	5	WO 97/42666	11/13/1997	WIPO		
	6	WO 96/26830	09/06/1996	WIPO		
OTHER DOCUMENTS (Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, etc.)						
	7	L. S. Hung et al., "Enhanced Electron Injection in Organic Electroluminescence Devices Using An Al/LiF Electrode", January 13, 1997, pp. 152-154, Apply. Phys. Lett. 70(2)				
	8	Kim et al., "Enhanced Quantum Efficiency in Polymer Electroluminescence Devices by Inserting a Tunneling Barrier Formed by Langmuir-Blodgett Films", July 29, 1996, pp. 599-601, Applied Physics Letters AIP USA, Vol. 69, No. 5				
	9	Jabbour et al., "Effects of Insulating Layers on the Performance of Organic Electroluminescent Devices", January 28, 1998, pp. 182-190, Proceedings of the SPIE-The International Society For Optical Engineering SPIE-Int. Soc. Opt. Eng				
		USA, Vol. 3281				
EXAMINER				DATE CONSIDERED		
Examiner: Initial if citation considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with M.P.E.P. 609; draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.						

Date: November 30, 2004